

Reproduced by the
CLEARINGHOUSE
for Federal Scientific & Technical
Information Springfield Va. 22151

**BLANK PAGES
IN THIS
DOCUMENT
WERE NOT
FILMED**

**JOINT PROGRAM OF
THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION AND THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
TO RESOLVE PROBLEMS
IN THE MANAGEMENT OF DEFENSE IN-HOUSE LABORATORIES**

30 June 1969

**Management Analysis Memorandum 69-2
Office for Laboratory Management
Office of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering
Washington, D. C. 20301**

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This program was monitored by three laboratory people during their 6-month tours of duty in the Office for Laboratory Management:

Arthur L. Jones, Naval Weapons Laboratory (Dahlgren, Virginia), September 1967--February 1968

James E. Spates, Harry Diamond Laboratories (Washington, D. C.), July--December 1968

Eugene G. Haberman, Air Force Rocket Propulsion Laboratory (Edwards Air Force Base, California), January--June 1969

Their participation was extremely helpful in the solution of many of these problems.

The editorial assistance of Beth R. King is also gratefully acknowledged.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Acknowledgments-----	ii
1. Introduction-----	1
2. Tabulation of Problems, Recommendations and Action Agents-----	3
3. Presentation: CSC/DoD Joint Program to Resolve Problems in the Management of Department of Defense In-House Laboratories-----	15
4. Status of Problems Identified by the Civil Service Commission-----	51
Abbreviations-----	65

1. INTRODUCTION

On 29 December 1967, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission (CSC) forwarded to the Secretary of Defense a report, *Problems in the Management of Department of Defense In-House Laboratories*. The report summarized the visits of regional and bureau directors of the CSC to 47 key Department of Defense (DoD) laboratories and technical organizations to investigate problems in personnel management and manpower. The problems thus identified are tabulated in part 2, together with their recommendations and the "action agents" in each case.

The Deputy Secretary of Defense sent this report on 8 February 1968 to the military departments, asking that they take appropriate action to solve those problems. In his forwarding memorandum he also said:

Many of these problems will require the concerted and coordinated efforts of our R&D, manpower and financial management organizations. Some require action within my office and I am initiating action accordingly. Others require action by the Civil Service Commission as indicated in the report. Many of the problems are of a long-standing nature, some possibly resulting from inadequate or misinterpreted communications between top management and the laboratory level or the overzealous applications of controls by middle management. The report stresses that many of the problems can be solved within the flexibilities allowed by the present Federal Personnel System.

Mr. Macy has emphasized that procedures, controls and administrative devices which are effective for operational and logistical organizations don't always make sense for R&D organizations, and pointed out that for this reason special provisions have been made within the Federal Personnel System to satisfy the unique needs of creative activities and people. We must therefore be assured that we have availed ourselves of these provisions and that they be implemented and understood at all levels.

A status report was presented to the Chairman and Commissioners of the Civil Service Commission on 28 May 1969 concerning action taken by the Department of Defense toward solving personnel and manpower problems in its laboratories. The visual aids used in this presentation are included in part 3.

Part 4 summarizes the status, as of 30 June 1969, of each problem identified in the CSC report and outlines actions taken thus far, as well as actions still required.

2. TABULATION OF PROBLEMS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTION AGENTS

The problems in this part are those that were highlighted in the Civil Service Commission's report of 27 December 1967.

The 15 most important problems are marked by a star in the left-hand margin.

Problem	Action Agent	Recommended Action
<p>1.1 <u>COORDINATING WORK LOAD, FUNDS, AND MANPOWER:</u> Work load, funds, and manpower are furnished to laboratories by separate sources that are not coordinated. This reduces the responsiveness of the laboratories and their ability to manage programs subject to dynamic change. Coping with multiple, uncoordinated controls requires an inordinate amount of the time and attention of top-level laboratory management that should be applied to the technical program.</p>	<p>DoD Army Navy AF</p>	<p>The DoD, working with the Military Departments, should improve the coordination of work load, funds, and manpower. The laboratories should be allowed greater flexibility of operation under a less fragmented, better coordinated control system. Among changes that should be considered are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased delegation of authority for manpower, organization, and personnel management to laboratory directors. - Delegation to laboratory directors of authority to make exceptions in particular circumstances to manpower ceilings, grade, and organizational control procedures. - Substitution of fiscal budgets (for in-house work) for present manpower ceiling controls. - Use of man-year accounting during the fiscal year. - Common DoD manpower control procedures for RDT&F activities.
<p>1.1a <u>Manpower Controls:</u> Administrative arrangements for manpower and personnel space control delay processing of personnel actions and inhibit the matching of work load, manpower, and funds.</p>	<p>Army Navy AF Labs</p>	<p>As an interim measure, significant increases in work load and funds, without increases in manpower authorizations, should be made only on approval of the Director of Laboratories after review with local laboratory management. (See also item 1.1b in the report.)</p>
<p>1.1a <u>Manpower Controls:</u> Administrative arrangements for manpower and personnel space control delay processing of personnel actions and inhibit the matching of work load, manpower, and funds.</p>	<p>Army</p>	<p>The Table of Distribution and Allowances system of the Department of the Army, as now applied, is inappropriate for RDT&E organizations. It underlies many of the local laboratory management problems. Unless improvements can be made to give greater authority and flexibility of operation at the laboratory level, the use of the system for RDT&E activities should be eliminated.</p>
<p>1.1a <u>Manpower Controls:</u> Administrative arrangements for manpower and personnel space control delay processing of personnel actions and inhibit the matching of work load, manpower, and funds.</p>	<p>AF</p>	<p>The Department of the Air Force should improve the timeliness and responsiveness of the Systems Command manpower and organizational control system. Care should be exercised in applying engineered manpower standards to RDT&E activities. Initial application of the standards should be treated as a research project with laboratory management participation in their study.</p>
<p>1.1b <u>Work Assignments, Funds, and Manpower:</u> Lack of coordination of work assignments, funds, and manpower limits the effectiveness of laboratory efforts to manage programs subject to dynamic changes.</p>	<p>DoD Army Navy AF</p>	<p>See item 1.1.</p>
<p>1.1c <u>Overtime Limitations:</u> Limitations on use of overtime inhibit the effectiveness of organizations having short lead-time schedule changes and work requirements, such as at the White Sands Missile Range.</p>	<p>Army Navy</p>	<p>Departments should explore the use of selective systems for controlling overtime that take into account the particular needs of RDT&E activities, especially those at the White Sands Missile Range and the Naval Weapons Center, Corona, which cited this problem.</p>

Problem	Action Agent	Recommended Action
1.1d <u>Across-the-Board Cuts in Personnel:</u> Across-the-board cuts in personnel based on "productivity assessments" are incompatible with laboratory-type operations.	Army	Productivity cuts, in principle, are incompatible with an expanding-technology and level-of-effort manpower ceiling. They should not be assessed against the in-house laboratories.
* 1.1e <u>Authority To Reprogram Funds:</u> Laboratories have limited authority to reprogram funds to meet new work situations. This reduces the laboratories' ability to carry through research and exploratory development and to utilize fully their resources.	Army Navy	The Departments of the Army and the Navy should consider delegating authority to laboratory management to reprogram funds for research and exploratory development (6.1 and 6.2 element funds).
<u>1.2 MAINTAINING A RESPONSIVE AND PRODUCTIVE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE</u>		
* 1.2a <u>Organizational Controls:</u> The Army's Table of Distribution and Allowances inhibits laboratory efforts to maintain a responsive and productive organizational structure.	Army	See item 1.1a.
1.2b <u>Application of the Dual Career Ladder Concept:</u> The dual career ladder concept (two-track system for classifying research positions), while generally receiving wide use, is receiving limited use in certain Army RDT&E activities.	Army	The Department of the Army should determine (1) whether limitations have been placed on the use of the two-track system and (2) whether its use is inhibited through misunderstandings by servicing personnel and manpower organizations. If limitations or misunderstandings are found, they should be eliminated.
* 1.2c <u>Establishment and Filling of GS-14 and GS-15 Positions:</u> Numerical limitations and delays in acting on the establishment of GS-14 and GS-15 positions have inhibited laboratory efforts to recruit skilled professionals and to place the laboratories' own personnel at proper levels.	Army Navy AF	The Military Departments should eliminate special controls for high-grade (GS-14 and 15) positions in the laboratories. Post-audit reviews should be used to check on laboratory use of delegated authority to establish and fill positions.
1.2d <u>Balance of In-House and Contract Efforts:</u> Assignment and funding of projects without accompanying allocations of manpower spaces limit in-house research capability and motivate dependence on contracts. The existing balance of in-house and contract efforts largely reflects the uncoordinated demands and controls on laboratories.	Army Navy AF	Funds, manpower, and project assignments should be coordinated so as to achieve the desired balance of in-house and contract programs in each laboratory. Procedures should be established to ensure that decisions on the proper balance are based on judgments by the Director of Laboratories and local laboratory management. (See also item 1.1.)

Problem	Action Agent	Recommended Action
<p>1.3 ESTABLISHING AND FILLING PUBLIC LAW 313 AND NON-QUOTA SUPERGRADE POSITIONS: The length of time (average of 150 to 180 days for the three Services) required to obtain approval of requests for establishment or changes to non-quota supergrade and Public Law 313 positions is excessive. The delays have reduced local management's ability (1) to compete successfully for quality talent at this level and (2) to recognize and compensate senior staff members for their responsibilities and contributions in a timely manner.</p> <p>1.4 RECRUITING TECHNICAL PERSONNEL</p> <p>1.4a Cooperative Educational Programs: Laboratories are experiencing difficulties in carrying out effective cooperative educational programs because of:</p> <p>Manpower space limitations: Laboratories are finding it increasingly difficult to devote limited manpower spaces to cooperative programs.</p> <p>Inability to conclude working agreements with colleges.</p> <p>Low pay for cooperative students, which results in low retention rate.</p> <p>Inequities in health benefits for co-op students in schools operating on a quarterly basis.</p>	<p>Army Navy AF</p> <p>DoD</p> <p>Army Navy</p> <p>Navy</p> <p>Army</p> <p>CSC</p>	<p>The Departments should institute rapid review systems. Changes should include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Eliminate some of the intermediate levels of review. - Center responsibility for review at each level. - Confine before-the-fact review to persons and organizations making substantive decisions on program content, position classification, and qualification of candidates. - Make after-the-fact reviews for other purposes, e.g., to administer numerical controls. - Ensure that any internally imposed information requirements are specifically stated. - Bring to the attention of the Civil Service Commission any externally imposed requirements that cause significant delays. <p>The DoD should consider expanding the pool of manpower spaces for long-term training to include cooperative education in order to provide the laboratories relief in the use of local resources for this investment in upgrading the organization.</p> <p>Additionally, the Departments of the Army and the Navy should employ man-year accounting (as opposed to monthly head counts and ceiling applications) to help solve this problem.</p> <p>The Department of the Navy should review the problems cited by the Naval Missile Center, Pt. Mugu, and the Naval Air Development Center, Johnsville; and, if existing regulations inhibit efforts to carry out a satisfactory program, the matter should be brought to the attention of the Commission.</p> <p>The Missile Command, where the problem was cited, should explore with the Department of the Army the desirability of requesting the Civil Service Commission to approve higher local pay rates.</p> <p>The Civil Service Commission will investigate the problem, take corrective action as required, and report back to the Departments.</p>

Problem	Action Agent	Recommended Action
1.4a (continued):		
Inability to make firm offers of appointment.	AF	The Department of the Air Force should review the problem cited by the School of Aerospace Medicine, Brooks Air Force Base, Texas, to determine whether full use is being made of existing authorities and flexibilities. If the matter cannot be resolved, it should be brought to the attention of the Civil Service Commission.
<p><u>1.4b Laboratory Participation in Recruiting Programs:</u> Certain laboratories within the Army Materiel Command believe that recruiting is overly centralized at the Command level. They desire more participation by their technical personnel in the recruiting, to visit more colleges than are now scheduled, and to have more intensive coverage than is now "permitted" by the AMC centralized scheduling.</p>	Army	There are misunderstandings concerning the role of the laboratories and the laboratory R&D people in college recruiting at certain laboratories of the Army Materiel Command. The Department of the Army should ensure that misunderstandings are cleared up, that AMC regulations are not being applied more restrictively than intended, and that the laboratories are fully informed of their authorities in this area.
<p><u>1.4c Timeliness and Effectiveness of Recruiting Efforts:</u> The cumulative effect of manpower controls and personnel regulations, many of which require before-the-fact approval, reduces the timeliness and effectiveness of recruiting efforts.</p>	<p>Army Navy AF</p>	<p>The long-range solution is to decentralize administration of manpower and organization controls. (See items 1.1 and 1.2.)</p>
*	Army Navy AF	As an interim solution, the Departments should authorize laboratory managers to establish a limited number of positions for uniquely qualified people without regard to space, high-grade limitations (through GS-15), and organizational limitations, but subject only to the usual position classification and merit promotion determinations at the local level. Overruns of regularly authorized personnel ceilings could be corrected by the laboratories through making personnel adjustments within a reasonable period thereafter.
	Labs	Laboratories (or their servicing personnel office) should negotiate with the servicing Interagency Board for authority to hire directly for positions where there are insufficient eligibles in either number or quality.
	Labs CSC	When needed, CSC regional offices have agreed to provide quick pre-audit service on laboratory requests to pay higher than minimum salary rates.

Problem	Action Agent	Recommended Action
<p>1.4d Timeliness of Security Clearance Procedures: Certain laboratories have been inordinately delayed in making firm offers of appointment to candidates for scientific and engineering positions because of the time required for national agency checks (which are required for security clearances for noncritical sensitive positions). These delays inhibit the laboratories in competing for quality personnel.</p>	<p>Labs</p> <p>Labs</p>	<p>Laboratories should make firm commitments for employment subject only to the individual's being suitable for security clearance.</p> <p>Where quick decisions are essential, more laboratories should establish procedures for bringing new employees on board prior to granting security clearances through temporary assignments to nonsensitive positions.</p>
<p>In the Navy Department, current security clearances of applicants granted by a Defense Industrial Security Clearance Office are not accepted by the hiring activity, thus delaying employment and utilization of personnel.</p>	<p>Navy</p>	<p>The Department of the Navy should review its security clearance requirements to determine whether the clearance process can be expedited, without loss of control, by accepting clearance granted by Defense Industrial Security Clearance Offices.</p>
<p>1.5 REFERRING TECHNICAL EMPLOYEES FOR SERVICE-WIDE PLACEMENT: Agency referral systems delay filling of key laboratory positions without recognizable positive results.</p>	<p>Army</p> <p>Navy</p>	<p>The Department of the Army should make certain that the career referral system provides quick reaction, for example, by issuing lists of candidates periodically in advance of need, and having system requirements met by laboratory consideration of candidates on the list. If quality candidates are not available through the system, the laboratories should be provided advance exception to its use.</p> <p>The Department of the Navy should ensure that its executive assignment system does not result in delays, does not undercut the laboratories' authority to select candidates, and does not inhibit laboratory efforts to recruit and fill key positions with quality talent from DoD and outside sources.</p>
<p>1.6 DEALING WITH THE MARGINAL EMPLOYEE: Some technical personnel have reached higher levels in RDT&E organizations than their capabilities warrant. Laboratory managers want improved management techniques and approaches to deal with the problem.</p>	<p>Labs</p> <p>CSC DoD Army Navy AF Labs</p>	<p>Authorities and flexibilities now provided by the Federal personnel system should be used more aggressively to deal with the problem.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the desirability of the recommendations contained in the study by the Federal Council for Science and Technology, <i>Management and the Marginal Employee</i>, March 1966.</p>
<p>The one-year probationary period is too short to evaluate the professional performance of scientists and engineers.</p>	<p>Army Navy AF</p>	<p>The Military Departments should investigate the need for extending the probationary period for R&D personnel. They should determine the extent of use of the present one-year period and the expected effects of lengthening the period, on both the upgrading of the staff and on recruiting. The Commission should be informed of the results of the investigation</p>
<p>The Army provides much broader rights of appeal of</p>	<p>Army</p>	

Problem	Action Agent	Recommended Action
1.6 (continued): dismissal during the probationary period than are provided by the Commission. Laboratory managers believe this has reduced the value of the probationary period.	Army	and the DoD recommendations. The Department of the Army should consider limiting the appeal rights of probationary employees to those established by the Civil Service Commission, unless it is shown conclusively that they are not adequate.
1.7 <u>UTILIZING THE TECHNICAL STAFF:</u> The utilization of technical staff is limited by manpower limitations and administrative arrangements which result in (1) inadequate technician support of scientists and engineers, (2) inadequate personnel office support of some Air Force and Army laboratories that are tenants, and (3) inadequate administrative support in some Army laboratories.	Army Navy AF	Funds, manpower, and work load should be better coordinated, and manpower and organizational controls should be decentralized, as previously recommended.
*	Army AF	The Departments of the Army and the Air Force should determine the adequacy of personnel support provided RDT&E activities, and where not adequate, provide the service needed by (1) improving or changing the present arrangements for financing and staffing the consolidated offices or (2) providing laboratories with their own personnel offices—or in the case of small laboratories a deputy or assistant personnel officer who would oversee the laboratory's personnel support and provide competent advisory service to laboratory management.
	Army	The Department of the Army should reduce and simplify the administrative paper work of management and control systems, or adequate in-house administrative support of laboratory management should be authorized. Corrective measures should ensure that top-level laboratory personnel are not burdened with nonessential paper work.
1.8 <u>DEVELOPING AND RECOGNIZING THE TECHNICAL STAFF</u>		
1.8a <u>Education and Training:</u> The Navy central control of long-term training, as now applied, reduces the usefulness of the program. Delayed approvals complicate the implementation of the program.	Navy	The Department of the Navy should provide prompt review and action on requests from the laboratories for funds and spaces from the DoD Long-Term Training Pool. Similarly, prompt action should be taken on laboratory requests for authority to use local resources for long-term training.
Two Air Force activities have had difficulty in providing part-time educational opportunities beyond the M.A. level.	AF	The Department of the Air Force should investigate the problem with the School of Aerospace Medicine and the 6570th Personnel Research Laboratory to determine whether all possibilities have been exhausted. Any remaining problem should be brought to the attention of the Civil Service Commission.

Problem	Action Agent	Recommended Action
1.8b <u>Attendance at Scientific Meetings:</u> In certain laboratories of the Departments of the Army and the Navy, travel to technical society meetings has been tightly restricted. The adverse effects have been disproportionate to the amount of funds involved.	Army Navy	Where not now provided, authority should be delegated to laboratory managers to review and control travel to professional meetings, subject to applicable guidelines covering travel for all purposes.
1.8c <u>Forms of Recognition Within Government:</u> Forms of recognition for scientific and professional employees are not adequate.	DoD Army Navy AF	The DoD and the Departments should encourage the use of outstanding laboratory personnel on key scientific and policy committees.
* 2.1 <u>MATCHING THE SALARY OFFERS OF COMPETITORS:</u> Superior candidates at the B.S., M.S., and Ph.D. levels are difficult to recruit and retain because Government salary levels are not competitive with those of private industry. Similarly, salaries are not adequate to attract and retain sufficient top-quality management personnel.	CSC	Legislation increasing pay of Federal employees generally has been enacted. The legislation will provide additional flexibility in setting rates of pay for scientists and engineers.
* 2.2 <u>PAYING TRAVEL EXPENSES FOR JOB INTERVIEWS:</u> Candidates at all levels are more difficult to recruit because laboratories are unable to pay travel costs for interviews.	CSC	The Civil Service Commission is now supporting a legislative proposal to authorize agencies to pay travel costs for job interviews. The bill is now being considered by the Congress.
2.3 <u>PAYING HIGHER WITHIN-GRADE SALARY RATES:</u> When recruiting superior quality candidates at the grade GS-11 and higher in a competitive market, an immediate decision on salary is sometimes essential. Laboratories are unable to make firm decisions on salary during the initial interview; Civil Service Commission approval is required on each case.	Army Navy AF CSC	The Departments should inform the Commission of (1) the need for delegated authority to make exceptions to existing salary rates and (2) whether this authority would be further delegated to the laboratory level. Where rapid response is essential, the Civil Service Commission will provide prompt action on requests for paying higher within-grade salary rates (normally within two to three days).
2.4 <u>EXAMINING FOR TECHNICAL PERSONNEL:</u> Laboratories are concerned that Interagency Boards of Examiners might not provide the quality and timeliness of service of the Boards of Examiners they replaced.	CSC Labs	Problems have been, or are in the process of being, resolved at the laboratory—CSC regional office level. Any new problems should be brought to the attention of the servicing Interagency Board or the appropriate CSC regional office.

Problem	Action Agent	Recommended Action
2.4 EXAMINING FOR TECHNICAL PERSONNEL (continued)		
Laboratories are concerned with the timeliness of their appointment offers during the recruiting visits to college campuses. They want to be able to make on-the-spot offers of appointment to quality candidates, in particular, during their visits.	Labs	Procedures exist which permit laboratory recruiters to make on-the-spot commitments to prospective candidates in shortage categories. Laboratory recruiters can be trained and designated as Board agents if the authority is needed. Laboratories should communicate with their Interagency Boards.
2.5 RECRUITING FOR SUMMER WORK: The current requirement that summer hires count under the regular laboratory personnel ceiling, plus the fact that the 30 June date for reporting agency on-board personnel strength figures comes in the midst of the influx of summer employees and June graduates, restricts the summer employment of students.	DoD Army Navy AF	The OSD and the Departments should provide relief either by the OSD's getting the Bureau of the Budget's approval of a more flexible personnel accounting procedure or by the Departments' allowing the laboratories to go over ceiling temporarily during the June-July period, making offsetting ceiling adjustments at other activities that are less subject to the influx of new employees.
The certification dates are too late in the school year to allow for appointment and security clearance procedures.	CSC	The 1968 summer employment examination schedule has been moved back as suggested. Rosters will be made available to agencies by 1 March 1968.
Laboratories desire to hire, on a noncompetitive basis, students who were summer employees the year before.	CSC	Provisions for continuity of employment (reemployment of former student workers) would require changes in the present examining system by the Civil Service Commission. The Commission will investigate the matter.
Difficulty was experienced in reaching science students on certificates.	Labs	Laboratories should explore selective certification procedures (for applicants with science backgrounds) and zone or area certification, where distance, housing, etc., are factors, with the appropriate Interagency Board.
Laboratories do not have the authority to appoint noncompetitively finalists in regional and area scientific competitions to GS-2 summer positions, as can now be done for national finalists.	CSC	The authority to give national science contest finalists excepted appointments without examination was limited to the 1967 summer employment period. Action to reinstate the authority and expand its use to regional or area finalists would require CSC action. The Commission will investigate the matter.

Problem	Action Agent	Recommended Action
2.5 RECRUITING FOR SUMMER WORK (cont'd. 1)		
Isolated laboratories have difficulty in filling summer positions because housing is not available for applicants from other areas, local applicants frequently are difficult to reach on the register, and sons and daughters of military and civilian personnel have been excluded.	Labs	Proposals to develop an appointment system for summer employment (outside the Summer Employment Examination) have been considered and found to be impracticable. However, the regulations have been changed (1) to permit hiring sons and daughters of military and civilian personnel when jobs are filled through an examination and the student stands highest on the appointment register and (2) to provide increased flexibility in certification of eligibles.
3.1 CLASSIFYING LABORATORY POSITIONS: Representatives of several Army laboratories stated that TDA controls precluded the use of multidisciplinary positions.		
Representatives of several Army and Air Force activities stated that they have had difficulty in arriving at the proper grade levels for nonresearch engineering positions.	Army AF	Army Headquarters personnel stated that it was not intended that TDA procedures preclude the establishment of interdisciplinary positions. The Department of the Army should remove any existing restrictions on establishing and using interdisciplinary positions; laboratory managers and personnel officers should be so informed. The Departments of the Army and the Air Force should review the position structure of the organizations in question to determine (1) the adequacy of position structure in terms of missions, (2) the correctness of classification of key positions, (3) the need for interpretive material for base classification personnel, (4) the use of existing flexibilities, and (5) the need for change in existing classification standards.
3.2 APPLICATION OF THE ENGINEER EQUIVALENCY TEST: The use of state boards of registration to obtain professional status for engineers is too slow (in Massachusetts). The laboratory recommended that the Commission's Engineer Equivalency Examination be reinstated.		
	CSC	This problem is under active consideration by the Civil Service Commission.
3.3 APPLYING THE CRITERIA FOR QUALITY COLLEGE GRADUATES: The present criteria for quality college graduates are too restrictive and too difficult to apply.		
	CSC	The Commission will review the recommendations to broaden the quality-graduate concept for M.S. and Ph.D. candidates.

Problem	Action Agent	Recommended Action
<p>3.4 DIVERSE WAGE RATES: Diverse wage rates for similar wage board positions within a commuting area lead to movement of employees from one activity to another.</p>	CSC	The Civil Service Commission has developed a coordinated Federal wage system which will provide uniform rates of pay in all Federal agencies for trades and labor employees performing similar work in the same local wage area. Implementation of the system should resolve most of the problems raised during the meetings.
<p>3.5 APPLYING THE COMMISSION'S SUITABILITY STANDARDS: In order to extend the base of applicants, Civil Service Commission Suitability Standards for appointees have been broadened. In some laboratories, all or most positions require noncritical-sensitive security clearances. As a result, persons are referred on certificates of eligibles who cannot be given the necessary security clearance.</p>	Labs	Laboratories should make greater use of the present Civil Service Commission regulations that permit passing over applicants who cannot be given necessary security clearance when cause is shown.
<p>3.6 USE OF THE COMMISSION'S QUESTIONNAIRE IN EXAMINING FOR UNGRADED POSITIONS: The value and ease of use of the Questionnaire for Ungraded Positions (<i>Civil Service Handbook X-118C</i>) was questioned.</p>	CSC	The Civil Service Commission will review the continued use of the questionnaire.
<p>3.7 TRAINING FOR AGENCY RECRUITERS: Laboratory representatives expressed a need for intense, short-term training of technical personnel who recruit new employees.</p>	Labs	Laboratories desiring this service should communicate with the Commission's Bureau of Recruiting and Examining (Mr. Allan W. Howerton) if located in the Washington area. Others should communicate with their Interagency Boards or CSC regional offices.
<p>3.8 CONFLICT OF INTEREST REGULATIONS: Navy laboratories have had difficulty in administering conflict of interest regulations. Employee morale has been adversely affected.</p>	Navy	Recent modifications to the regulation should meet most of the objections. The Department of the Navy should determine whether a significant problem remains and, if so, should present the matter to the Civil Service Commission.

PART 3

CSC/DOD
Joint Program
to

**RESOLVE PROBLEMS
IN THE MANAGEMENT OF
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
IN-HOUSE LABORATORIES**

3.1 Chronology

Investigations into the management problems of the Defense in-house laboratories go back to the late 1940s. The most recent efforts in the DoD were Task 97 (from 1961 to 1965) and the 1966 study of in-house laboratories that resulted in a report commonly referred to as the "42 Problems," of which 20 were in the personnel management area. As a result of this study, Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., Director of Defense Research and Engineering, and Mr. John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman, Civil Service Commission, got together and initiated the current joint CSC—DoD program.

From May to June 1967, personnel of the CSC regional offices met with 270 managers representing 47 DoD laboratories.

The results of these discussions were summarized in the December 1967 report, which not only identified problem areas but recommended specific corrective actions.

The past year has been spent in planning, carrying out and reviewing these actions.

CSC/DOD
PROBLEMS IN THE MANAGEMENT OF THE DOD
IN-HOUSE LABORATORIES

CHRONOLOGY

FEB 67	DOD/CSC DISCUSSIONS
MAY-JUNE 67	LABS/CSC REGIONAL OFFICES MEETINGS
27 DEC 67	CSC REPORT (BUREAU OF INSPECTIONS) "PROBLEMS IN THE MANAGEMENT OF DOD IN-HOUSE LABORATORIES. "
8 FEB 68	OSD MEMORANDUM TO MILITARY DEPART- MENTS REQUESTING COMMENTS AND ACTION PLANS
MAR-APR 68	MILITARY DEPARTMENT COMMENTS AND ACTION PLANS
11 OCT 68	OSD (DDR&E) COMMENTS ON PROGRESS FORWARDED TO MILITARY DEPARTMENTS
DEC 68-FEB 69	MILITARY DEPARTMENT STATUS REPORTS
11 MAR 69	REVIEW-DDR&E/LAB DIRECTORS
20 MAY 69	DOD/CSC STATUS REVIEW

3.2 General Conclusions

The involvement of the CSC has served to remove the vague and often erroneous criticisms of the "system." It has demonstrated that the government's overall personnel management system is more flexible than most people realize, and it also dramatized the fact that the CSC itself is interested and responsive.

Personnel managers in the DoD have been forced to reexamine their own rules, regulations and policies, as well as their implementation. Since the basic CSC policies are flexible, they have found that they do possess the authority to make significant improvements. As a result, more authority has been delegated to the laboratories.

The positive approach of the CSC has enabled a positive innovative approach by the DoD. More emphasis is being placed on seeking out ways of improving personnel policies. The CSC's flexibility and responsiveness have encouraged people to seek new management approaches.

The recruiting area has been considerably improved. Many misunderstandings have been clarified. Cooperative efforts involving the CSC regional offices, the interagency boards and the laboratories have evolved. Overall salary increases have been coupled with specific flexibilities to make the DoD labs more competitive with other employees for quality candidates.

To maintain current advances, as well as make further progress, high-level management must continue to make its interest known. The problems that remain are the hardest to solve.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

- PARTICIPATION OF CSC HAS CLEARED THE AIR ON INFLEXIBILITY IN THE FEDERAL PERSONNEL SYSTEM
- MOST PROBLEMS IN THE PERSONNEL AREA RESOLVABLE BY MILITARY DEPARTMENTS OR OSD
- MUCH MORE AUTHORITY OVER PERSONNEL AND FISCAL MATTERS HAS BEEN DELEGATED TO THE LABS
- CSC HAS PROVIDED BASIS FOR INNOVATIVE APPROACHES
- MANY ACTIONS TAKEN BY CSC WERE HELPFUL IN IMPROVING RECRUITING
- CONTINUED HIGH LEVEL MANAGEMENT ATTENTION REQUIRED

3.3 Problems Identified in the CSC Report

The problem areas identified in the CSC report are broad categories that contain one or more specific problems. The action items are those for which a specific agency was identified as an action agent with regard to a specific problem. If several agencies needed to act on a problem, there would be an equivalent number of action items.

PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED IN CSC REPORT

21 PROBLEM AREAS

- 8 MAJOR AREAS RESOLVABLE BY DOD
- 5 MAJOR AREAS REQUIRING CSC AND/OR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION
- 8 MISCELLANEOUS AREAS REQUIRING ACTION BY BY DOD AND/OR CSC

WITH 33 SPECIFIC PROBLEMS

- 14 CONSIDERED CRITICAL

REQUIRING 104 ACTION ITEMS

- 37 CONSIDERED CRITICAL

3.4 Overall Status Summary (Definitions)

Resolved—The required action has been completed, and no further action is necessary. This may also apply in cases in which a problem was identified but was an isolated example and did not truly represent the situation. Some problems were considered resolved when a review by either the CSC or the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) indicated that no action should be taken, even though this might not satisfy laboratory managers.

In process—Some action has been taken, but further actions or approvals that appear to be capable of resolving the problem are required.

Unresolved—The problem still exists and is still considered a problem by the OSD and/or the CSC. Effective action has not been taken. Where legislation is required, a problem is considered unresolved until a law is signed—owing to the uncertainty of legislative actions.

OVERALL STATUS SUMMARY

TOTAL ACTION ITEMS - 104

64	RESOLVED	(62 %)
25	IN PROCESS	(24 %)
15	UNRESOLVED	(14 %)

CRITICAL PROBLEM ITEMS - 37

17	RESOLVED	(46 %)
11	IN PROCESS	(30 %)
9	UNRESOLVED	(24 %)

3.5 Balancing Work Load, Funding and Manpower

The most critical problem area is concerned with balancing work load, funding and manpower. It should be noted that *all* unresolved DoD action items relate to this problem, which revolves around the fact that both funding and manpower controls are used but they are separate and often out of balance. Work load may come from a variety of sources, some of which may provide funding and no manpower. Because of the seriousness of this problem and its relation to the overall Planning, Programming, Budgeting System (PPBS), the OSD has taken the following actions:

- (1) A "manpower subsystem" is being added to the budgeting system to show the manpower resources required for each budget item.
- (2) A complete review of the PPBS with regard to the coordination and allocation of funds and manpower is being made by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Systems Analysis).
- (3) An experiment is being designed to test the thesis that laboratory effectivity would be improved if manpower controls were removed and only fiscal controls used. We call this our REFLEX (Resources Flexibility) experiment. Its major point is that the laboratory manager should have wide latitude in organizing and manning his laboratory to accomplish the assigned work with the funds allocated. Manpower and grade limitations would be eliminated, and the laboratory could determine the composition of its own work force.

BALANCING WORKLOAD, FUNDING AND MANPOWER

**ALL DOD UNRESOLVED ACTION ITEMS RELATE TO
BALANCING WORKLOAD, FUNDING AND MANPOWER**

**COMPLETE REVIEW OF PLANNING PROGRAMMING
BUDGETING SYSTEM IN PROCESS**

REFLEX EXPERIMENT IN DESIGN STAGE

**AN EXPERIMENT TO MANAGE LABORATORIES
THROUGH FISCAL LIMITATIONS ONLY**

- **FUNDING CONTROLLED AT HIGHER HQ**
- **NO MANPOWER CEILINGS**
- **NO GRADE QUOTAS**
- **ORGANIZATION CONTROLLED AT
LABORATORY LEVEL**

3.6 Manpower/Organization Controls

The Army and the Air Force had a system of manpower documents (TDAs in the Army, UDLs in the Air Force) that had to be changed and approved by higher headquarters before positions could be moved within an organization. This was a time-consuming, action-delaying approach to organizational controls. The Army has done what was necessary to resolve this problem. The Air Force has not yet completed its action to that end.

MANPOWER/ORGANIZATION CONTROLS

PROBLEM:

HIGHER HQ APPROVAL REQUIRED TO MOVE EXISTING
MANPOWER POSITIONS TO MEET CHANGES IN WORKLOAD

STATUS:

NAVY - NOT A PROBLEM

ARMY -

- LABS NOW AUTHORIZED TO MOVE POSITIONS BELOW SUPERGRADE LEVELS
- ANNUAL UPDATE AND REVIEW OF ORGANIZATIONAL AUTHORIZATION DOCUMENT (TDA)

AIR FORCE - REAFFIRMING LAB DIRECTORS' AUTHORITY
TO MOVE POSITIONS

- INSTRUCTING PERSONNEL OFFICES TO ACT DIRECTLY ON LAB REQUESTS
- AFTER THE FACT REVIEW BY SYSTEMS COMMAND MANPOWER ORGANIZATION

3.7 Authority To Reprogram Funds

The funding structure of the Army and the Navy, coupled with the broad scope of their laboratories' activities, has severely limited laboratory managers' ability to reprogram funds. Funds come to the laboratories from various organizations within each department under different program elements and appropriations. In the Air Force Systems Command (AFSC), the laboratories are primarily involved in either research or exploratory development, and single-program-element funding has been the normal method of operation.

The Navy has consolidated its program structure to the point where there is a single "work order" for the exploratory development work a Navy laboratory is doing for a given Navy command. This improves flexibility in that area. The research area was already flexible.

In the Army, an experiment is planned for FY 1970 in which there will be some single-program-element funding in two or three Army laboratories so that the effects on laboratory flexibility and output may be observed.

AUTHORITY TO REPROGRAM FUNDS

PROBLEM:

LABORATORIES HAVE LIMITED AUTHORITY TO
REPROGRAM FUNDS DUE TO PROGRAM FUNDING
STRUCTURE

STATUS:

AIR FORCE - LAB DIRECTORS ALREADY HAD
NECESSARY AUTHORITY

NAVY - CONSOLIDATED PROGRAM STRUCTURE
TO IMPROVE FLEXIBILITY AT LAB LEVEL

ARMY - WILL CONDUCT EXPERIMENT ON SINGLE
PROGRAM ELEMENT PER LAB IN FY 1970

3.8 Establishing and Filling GS-14 and GS-15 Positions

At the time of the initial DoD laboratory visits under the CSC study, there were quotas on GS-14 and GS-15 positions that had been imposed by the OSD. This created a problem that was especially apparent where doctorate-level personnel were involved. The OSD eliminated the restrictions on positions below the supergrades. The military departments still required headquarters approval of these positions.

The Army and the Navy have delegated to their major laboratories authority to establish GS-14 and GS-15 positions. This was done in both cases after command and headquarters personnel reviewed the laboratories' approaches to position management. Actions are reviewed after the fact, and trends will be analyzed.

Air Force regulations now allow delegation of this authority to laboratory directors. However, the AFSC has not yet made the necessary delegation.

Army, Navy and Air Force laboratories have the authority to fill positions, subject to their respective career referral systems.

ESTABLISHING AND FILLING GS-14 & GS-15 POSITIONS

PROBLEM:

QUOTAS AND LENGTHY APPROVAL CHANNELS

STATUS:

OSD - ELIMINATED QUOTAS

NAVY -

- DELEGATED AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH AND FILL GS-14 & GS-15 POSITIONS TO MAJOR LABORATORIES
- ANNUAL PLAN REQUIRED - DEVIATIONS ACCEPTABLE
- AFTER THE FACT REVIEW

ARMY -

- DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO FILL GS-14 & GS-15's, NOT INCLUDED IN DA S&E CAREER PROGRAM
- DELEGATED AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH GS-14 & GS-15 POSITIONS TO MAJOR LABORATORIES
- AFTER THE FACT REVIEW

AIR FORCE -

- LABORATORY DIRECTORS, THRU CIVILIAN POLICY BOARDS CAN CLASSIFY AND FILL GS-14 & GS-15 POSITIONS
- WORKING ON DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO LABORATORY DIRECTORS (CIVILIAN POLICY BOARD) TO ESTABLISH GS-14 & GS-15 POSITIONS

3.9 Utilizing the Technical Staff

Manpower restrictions (ceilings) affect the productivity of scientific and engineering (S&E) laboratory personnel because the labs' support becomes limited. This causes S&E personnel to do many tasks of a non-S&E nature. Number ceilings tend to drive an organization toward higher level personnel, for most managers seem to believe that people's total output is related to their grades. When there are staff reductions, support-type positions are the first to be eliminated. The REFLEX experiment will test the premise that fiscal controls without manpower controls would allow laboratory management to select a more productive work-force structure than that permitted by current controls on manpower as well as funds.

The Army has taken action to improve personnel administrative support for its laboratories by reorganizing and strengthening the personnel offices that serve the laboratories.

UTILIZING THE TECHNICAL STAFF

PROBLEM:

MANPOWER LIMITATIONS CAUSE LOSS OF PRODUCTIVITY
OF TECHNICAL STAFF THROUGH

- INADEQUATE TECHNICIAN SUPPORT
- INADEQUATE PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

STATUS:

OSD - REFLEX EXPERIMENT

ARMY - REORGANIZED PERSONNEL OFFICES FOR
IMPROVED LAB SUPPORT

ARMY/NAVY/AIR FORCE
IN TIMES OF MANPOWER SHORTAGE PREFER
TO KEEP S&E POSITIONS IN SPITE OF POOR
UTILIZATION

3.10 Establishing and Filling PL-313 and Nonquota Supergrade Positions

The approval channels and procedures for filling PL-313 and supergrade positions have been so lengthy that the processing time for those positions has ranged from 9 to 18 months. Most of this was consumed within the military departments. There were a wide variety of procedures and a great deal of processing in series. With the cooperation of the CSC, much progress has been made toward improving the situation.

The Navy has instituted parallel processing and follow-up procedures, both internally and with the CSC, for outside hires as well as Navy personnel. The Air Force has limited itself to establishing priority parallel processing procedures for outside hires only.

The Army has clarified and consolidated its procedures.

ESTABLISHING & FILLING PL-313 & NON-QUOTA SUPERGRADE POSITIONS

PROBLEM:

- LENGTHY APPROVAL CHANNELS LONG DELAYS

STATUS:

- OSD - ALLOWED USE OF PL-313 AT POSITIONS
WITH GS-16 SALARY LEVELS
- NAVY - INSTITUTED PARALLEL PROCESSING
PROCEDURES INTERNALLY AND WITH
CSC
- AIR FORCE - DEVELOPED PRIORITY PROCESSING
PROCEDURES INTERNALLY AND WITH
CSC FOR OUTSIDE HIRES
- ARMY - CLARIFIED AND CONSOLIDATED
PROCEDURES

3.11 Referring Technical Employees for Service-Wide Placement

The Army and the Navy have service-wide referral systems for S&E personnel. The Air Force has not.

Some Army laboratory managers did not believe that the Army's S&E career program referral system was worth the effort and delays it caused. To reduce both time and effort, the Army has instituted parallel processing where qualified candidate lists can be made available pending other actions required to establish the position. Advanced lists can be obtained by the laboratories. A 10-day time limit has been established for referral actions.

Navy managers were more concerned about top-level assignments; they believed the overall Navy referral system did not delay action or limit their ability to make the necessary hiring commitments. The Navy executive assignment system, which is now operational, should alleviate some of the concern about the high-level positions. The use of standardized job descriptions for many executive positions should also increase flexibility of assignments.

REFERRING TECHNICAL EMPLOYEES FOR SERVICE WIDE PLACEMENT

PROBLEM:

- EXCESSIVE DELAYS - MODEST PAYOFF

STATUS:

- AIR FORCE - NOT A PROBLEM
- ARMY - STREAMLINED DA S&E CAREER
PROGRAM REFERRAL SYSTEM
10 DAY TIME LIMIT-LABS CAN
GET ADVANCED LISTS
- NAVY - NAVY EXECUTIVE ASSIGNMENT
SYSTEM IS NOW OPERATIONAL

3.12 Recruiting

Progress in the recruiting area has been very encouraging. Cooperation between regional CSC offices, the interagency boards and the laboratories has reduced existing problems to a minimum. In many cases, the labs can now make on-the-spot job offers and confirm them with minimum delay. Better training is being given to laboratory and agency recruiters.

The ability to meet competition has been improved through the use of higher within-grade salaries, more liberal criteria for quality college graduates, and recent salary increases. The outstanding problem that remains is the payment of expenses for job interviews. Legislation has been introduced in the 91st Congress as a result of a legislative proposal by the CSC to allow payment of interview expenses in certain critical skills.

RECRUITING

PROBLEMS:

- MATCHING SALARY OFFERS OF COMPETITORS
- MANPOWER LIMITATIONS AND PERSONNEL PROCEDURES REDUCE EFFECTIVITY OF RECRUITING
- TRAINING OF RECRUITERS
- CRITERIA FOR QUALITY COLLEGE GRADUATES
- EXAMINING FOR TECHNICAL PERSONNEL
- TRAVEL EXPENSES FOR JOB INTERVIEWS

RECRUITING (Continued)

STATUS:

CSC/CONGRESS

- RAPID PRE-AUDIT ON HIGHER WITHIN GRADE SALARIES
- RECENT AND FORTHCOMING SALARY INCREASES
- CSC HAS OFFERED TO TRAIN RECRUITERS
- CRITERIA FOR QUALITY COLLEGE GRADUATES AND ADVANCED DEGREE HOLDERS HAVE BEEN SUITABLY REVISED
- INTERAGENCY BOARDS DESIGNATE AGENCY RECRUITERS AS BOARD AGENTS TO ALLOW ON-THE-SPOT OFFERS
- LEGISLATION HAS BEEN INTRODUCED TO PAY FOR JOB INTERVIEW EXPENSES (CSC/ADMINISTRATION LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL)

MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

- INCREASED TRAINING OF RECRUITERS
- PROVISION OF SPACES FOR OUTSTANDING INDIVIDUALS
- PROVISION OF SUPPLEMENTARY SPACES FOR JUNE GRADS

3.13 Salary Comparability for Engineers

The OSD has conducted a survey of the salaries of S&E professionals employed in the DoD laboratories, ranges, test centers and certain engineering organizations. These results have been compared to a survey sponsored by the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the DoD and conducted by the Battelle Memorial Institute (BMI) at Columbus, Ohio, which covered S&E professionals engaged in research and development in industry, educational institutions, nonprofit research institutes, government laboratories, and Federal Contract Research Centers. The comparison shown relates to engineers only and uses the distribution of personnel and the salary levels of the DoD and BMI surveys.

The DoD is comparable in salary at the B.S. level, but is behind at advanced-degree levels. This is quite important, because we need and are trying to attract more personnel with advanced degrees and to improve our capability to solve increasingly complex problems.

SALARY COMPARABILITY DATA FOR ENGINEERS **(Based on Battelle and OSD Studies)**

SEPTEMBER 1, 1968

Source	Salary Level	Average Monthly Salary		
		BS	MS	Ph. D.
OSD	DOD RDT&E	\$1,112	\$1,195	\$1,303
BATTELLE	INDUSTRY	\$1,116	\$1,271	\$1,399
	DIFFERENCE	\$ -4	\$ -76	\$ -96
	PERCENT	-0.4%	-6.0%	-6.9%

- BMI SURVEY ALSO SHOWS THAT SUPPLEMENTARY COMPENSATION (FRINGE BENEFITS) IS SLIGHTLY HIGHER IN INDUSTRY THAN THE FEDERAL LABS
- DOD RDT&E ORGANIZATIONS ARE
 - COMPETITIVE AT B. S. LEVEL
 - STILL LAGGING AT THE ADVANCED DEGREE LEVELS

3.14 Career Development

The OSD maintains a data bank on all in-house Defense RDT&E activities, including laboratories, test centers and ranges. The composition of their civilian work force is shown for 1 July 1968, as well as some figures that illustrate the career-development opportunities offered in the DoD. Many people make gross misstatements about actual practices in this area.

The 3.7 percent of degreed personnel represents 956 people who are being sent to graduate school on a full-time salary with tuition and expenses paid. Another 19.8 percent of degreed personnel are doing part-time graduate study, which is usually provided by the organization at little or no cost to the individual.

More than one out of every four professionals attended a scientific meeting in FY 1968; most of them went to more than one.

CAREER DEVELOPMENT DATA

(OSD RDT&E ACTIVITY DATA BANK)

**27,830 CIVILIAN PROFESSIONALS IN LABS, TEST CENTER AND
RANGES CONSISTING OF:**

NON-DEGREE	1,855	6.7%
BS	18,716	67.2%
MS	4,961	17.8%
PhD	2,298	8.3%

FULL TIME GRADUATE STUDENTS 956 (3.7% OF DEGREE)

PART TIME GRADUATE STUDENTS 5,148 (19.8% OF DEGREE)

ATTENDED ONE OR MORE SCIENTIFIC MEETINGS 28%
(OSD SURVEY)

3.15 Dealing with the Marginal Employee

This is one of the most difficult problems in the entire spectrum of personnel management. The development of better evaluation techniques for determining employee productivity and performance is needed. Supervisors should be trained to recognize the marginal employee and make better use of him. Some of our S&E people are falling behind the rapidly changing technology, which is one reason we emphasize graduate training, both part-time and full-time. The system must be made as flexible as possible so that equitable treatment of personnel can be coupled with high organizational performance.

One approach to the problem of older employees who become marginal in their productivity is to allow management to retire them when they are eligible. This is a controversial matter and would require legislation. The time is probably not ripe to press for such action.

The problem of appeal rights, especially during the probationary period, has arisen. Both the Army and the Navy had broader appeal rights than the Commission requires.

There was considerable discussion about extending the probationary period for S&E personnel beyond one year. The Federal Council for Science and Technology, in its report, *Management and the Marginal Employee*, March 1966, recommended that the feasibility of longer probationary periods be studied. The Navy has tried to have the probationary period extended in some specific cases. After reviewing the congressional hearings (Veterans' Act of 1944) that led to their specifying a probationary period of one year, however, the CSC believes they are bound by the intent of Congress that one year should be the maximum period of probation.

Consideration of problems relating to the marginal employee has led to more supervisor training and conditioning toward alertness in this area. Special attention is being given to the probationary period. The Navy has brought its appeal rights into line with CSC requirements. The Army is still wrestling with this problem.

The Navy is trying to improve evaluation techniques for R&D personnel. They are also working on a trial retirement program similar to that of the Air Force.

DEALING WITH THE MARGINAL EMPLOYEE

PROBLEMS:

- AVAILABILITY AND USE OF ADEQUATE
MANAGERIAL TECHNIQUES
- LENGTH OF PROBATIONARY PERIOD (NAVY)
- APPEAL RIGHTS (ARMY) BROADER THAN CSC
REQUIRES

STATUS:

CSC/CONGRESS

- CSC SHOULD SEEK LEGISLATION TO ALLOW
MANAGEMENT OPTION RETIREMENT
- CSC BELIEVES THAT IT IS BOUND BY
CONGRESSIONAL INTENT TO MAINTAIN A
MAXIMUM PROBATIONARY PERIOD OF
ONE YEAR

The Air Force's trial retirement system, which is about a year old, allows an employee to retire, with the option of returning within one year at no loss in pay or grade (GS-15 and below). Results are now being analyzed.

DEALING WITH THE MARGINAL EMPLOYEE (Continued)

STATUS:

MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

- INCREASED AWARENESS HAS LED TO MORE TRAINING IN ALL DEPARTMENTS
- AF PREPARING "DO'S AND DON'TS" PAMPHLET FOR SUPERVISORS
- NAVY WORKING ON NEW EVALUATION TECHNIQUES FOR R&D PERSONNEL
- NAVY HAS BROUGHT APPEAL RIGHTS IN LINE WITH CSC MINIMUM
- ARMY IS WORKING ON REDUCING APPEAL RIGHTS - BUT STILL ABOVE CSC MINIMUM
- AIR FORCE HAD NO PROBLEM WITH APPEAL RIGHTS
- AIR FORCE HAS A TRIAL RETIREMENT PROGRAM
- NAVY IN WORKING ON ESTABLISHMENT OF A TRIAL RETIREMENT PROGRAM

3.16 Unresolved Problems

All of the military departments' unresolved problems are the result of manpower ceilings. Most of them were discussed in this presentation. The freedom of laboratory management to decide whether a job can best be accomplished in-house or on contract is severely inhibited by manpower controls. In some instances, higher costs are incurred and an inferior product results because the laboratory's capability cannot be fully utilized.

The Army and the Navy do not have enough personnel spaces to conduct an adequate cooperative work study program.

The Army labs have been subjected to manpower reductions in the guise of productivity cuts--that is, as they get more experience, they become more productive. This attitude is incompatible with an R&D environment in which problems are becoming increasingly complex.

Completion of CSC action items that are unresolved depends upon legislation. Only the Congress can resolve those issues.

It should be noted again that the unresolved problems are both important and difficult. They can only be solved through the attention and interest of management at a high level.

UNRESOLVED PROBLEMS

ARMY

1. MATCHING WORK ASSIGNMENTS, FUNDS, MANPOWER (Reflex)
2. UTILIZING THE TECHNICAL STAFF (S&E/ Technicians)
3. BALANCE OF IN-HOUSE & CONTRACT EFFORTS
4. CO-OPERATIVE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS
5. ACROSS THE BOARD "PRODUCTIVITY" CUTS

NAVY

1. MATCHING WORK ASSIGNMENTS, FUNDS, MANPOWER (Reflex)
2. UTILIZING THE TECHNICAL STAFF (S&E/Technicians)
3. BALANCE OF IN-HOUSE & CONTRACT EFFORTS
4. CO-OPERATIVE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

AIR FORCE

1. MATCHING WORK ASSIGNMENTS, FUNDS, MANPOWER (Reflex)
2. UTILIZING THE TECHNICAL STAFF (S&E/Technicians)
3. BALANCE OF IN-HOUSE & CONTRACT EFFORTS
4. UTILIZING THE TECHNICAL STAFF (Pers. & Admin. Support)

CSC - LEGISLATION REQUIRED

1. MANAGEMENT OPTION RETIREMENT
2. PAYMENT OF TRAVEL EXPENSES FOR INTERVIEWS

STATUS OF ACTION ITEMS

ARMY 30 ACTION ITEMS

16	RESOLVED	(53 %)
9	IN PROCESS	(30 %)
5	UNRESOLVED	(17 %)

NAVY 27 ACTION ITEMS

21	RESOLVED	(78 %)
2	IN PROCESS	(7 %)
4	UNRESOLVED	' %)

AIR FORCE 21 ACTION ITEMS

10	RESOLVED	(48 %)
7	IN PROCESS	(33 %)
4	UNRESOLVED	(19 %)

OSD 4 ACTION ITEMS

1	RESOLVED	(25 %)
3	IN PROCESS	(75 %)

CSC 22 ACTION ITEMS

16	RESOLVED	(73 %)
4	IN PROCESS	(18 %)
2	UNRESOLVED	(9 %)

4. STATUS OF PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED BY
THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
(As of 30 June 1969)

STATUS OF DOD/CSC PROBLEMS

Revised: 30 June 1969

Problem	Resolved	In process	Unresolved	Not a problem	Action taken	Action remaining
*1.1 COORDINATION OF WORK LOAD, FUNDS AND MANPOWER						
*1.1a Manpower Controls: Complex administrative arrangements requiring approval by higher headquarters inhibit moving manpower to meet shifts in work load.	Army			Navy	Army labs have been delegated authority to move spaces and positions within ceilings as requirements arise. TDA is updated and reviewed at start of CY. (DA letter, 16 March 1968.)	
	USAF				Lab directors have authority to move positions and spaces, with after-the-fact documentation. AFSC instructed CPOs to act directly upon lab directors' requests without waiting for MET approval. (Hq AFSC(SCPC) letter, 9 June 1969.)	
*1.1b Work Assignment, Funds and Manpower: The labs' work load, funds and manpower derive from separate sources, which severely hampers flexibility and ability to match work load and resources.		OSD	Army Navy USAF		The DOR&E and the ASD(SA) are planning an experiment to determine whether re-moving manpower controls will improve the labs' performance.	The OSD experiment plan must be completed, the experiment run, and the results analyzed. A final recommendation, supported by facts and figures, can then be made.
					The OSD is also reviewing current systems for assigning work and authorizing funds and manpower to determine where the problems are.	Initial input from the military departments has been received. The review must be completed and analyzed. Where possible, the operation of existing systems should be improved.
					The ASD(SA) and the ASD(Comptroller) have drafted a DoD Instruction, "Manpower Subsystems to Five-Year Defense Program," that will provide manpower data directly related to the program elements as structured in the FYDP. An RDT&E funding subsystem will also be developed, which can then be combined with the manpower subsystem to present an integrated program.	Implement the manpower subsystem (FY 1970). Develop and implement the RDT&E funding subsystem. Integrate the two systems.

Note: *Identified by the CSC as a major problem.

STATUS OF DOD/CSC PROBLEMS (continued)

Problem	Resolved	In process	Unresolved	Not a problem	Action taken	Action remaining
1.1c <u>Overtime Limitations:</u>	Army Navy			USAF	OSD Limitations on manpower have not been removed. The DDR&E investigated and found this is a local problem that can be overcome by reasonable planning and local controls. Quarterly overtime ceilings are established at OSD and departmental levels, and there are provisions to accommodate changes in requirements and real emergencies.	
1.1d <u>Across-the-Board Cuts in Personnel (Based on Productivity Assessments):</u>		Army			Army states that AMC labs have received "favorable consideration," compared to the rest of the command.	
*1.1e <u>Authority to Reprogram Funds: Labs' authority is limited, which reduces flexibility to meet changing requirements. There are too many small, separate authorizations.</u>		Army			Army is conducting tests on three labs using single-element program funding, starting in FY 1970. Navy is reducing number of program elements in exploratory development from 26 to 20. Each lab will have only one work order for exploratory development per systems command.	Complete test, analyze results, and finalize recommendations.
1.2 <u>MAINTAINING A RESPONSIVE AND PRODUCTIVE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE</u>						
*1.2a <u>Organizational Controls: TDA limits responsiveness of Army laboratories.</u>	Army			USAF Navy	(See 1.1a.) TDA is now updated and reviewed annually--after the fact.	
1.2b <u>Application of Dual Ladder Concept: Army application of nonsupervisory classifications appeared limited.</u>	Army			USAF Navy	Army has reaffirmed policy on use of dual ladder concept and has issued clarifying instructions. (Change to CPC 505, 14 October 1968.)	

Note: *Identified by the CSC as a major problem.

STATUS OF DOD/CSC PROBLEMS (continued)

Problem	Resolved	In process	Unresolved	Not a problem	Action taken	Action remaining
*1.2c Establishing and Filling GS-14 and GS-15 Positions: Quotas and lengthy approval channels are time-consuming and cause loss of personnel in recruiting and retention.	OSD Navy Army				OSD eliminated high-grade numerical quotas by ASD(MARA) memorandum, 6 November 1967. Navy has delegated necessary authority to major labs that have developed acceptable position management systems. (NAVMAT INST 1200.3A, 24 June 1968.) Army has delegated authority to establish GS-14 and 15 positions to major labs after a review of their position management systems. Authority to fill positions exempt from referral under DA E&S career program has been delegated.	
		USAF			Air Force has delegated authority to classify and fill GS-14 and GS-15 positions (AFSCR 20-4, 19 February 1968) but not to establish them. Air Force now permits delegation (AFR 26-4, 28 May 1968).	AFSC must delegate authority to establish high-grade positions.
1.2d Balance of In-House and Contract Efforts: Projects are assigned to the labs and funded without accompanying allocation of manpower, and this limits choice of action.			Army Navy USAF		None. There is freedom of choice, but manpower ceilings place severe limitations on it. Final balance is based on priorities and availability of manpower.	
		OSD			OSD experiment discussed in item 1.1b will consider this question.	(See item i.1b.)

Note: *Identified by the CSC as a major problem.

STATUS OF DOD/CSC PROBLEMS (continued)

Problem	Resolved	In process	Unresolved	Not a problem	Action taken	Action remaining
*1.3 ESTABLISHING AND FILLING PL-313 AND NONQUOTA SUPERGRADE POSITIONS: Excessive time is required to take actions. This complicates the acquiring of new personnel and promotions.	Navy				Navy has established parallel processing procedures, both internal and with CSC-- also short suspenses for action. Improved procedures for limited executive assignments have been developed.	
		USAF			Air Force has developed priority processing procedures that involve parallel actions, both internal and with CSC, only for outside hires.	Priority procedures should be extended to promotions as well as outside hires.
		Army			Army has clarified and consolidated procedures. (DCSPER letter, 6 November 1968.)	Army should institute parallel processing procedures similar to Navy's
1.4 RECRUITING TECHNICAL PERSONNEL						
1.4a Cooperative Educational Programs: Lack of manpower spaces.	USAF	OSD	Army Navy		The DDR&E and the ASD(M&RA) are working on plans to establish a DoD manpower pool for "co-op" students.	Completion of OSD planning; obtaining the necessary funded position for the pool.
Problems in concluding agreements with colleges.	Navy			Army USAF	AFSC has established specific positions for co-op students (positions taken out of AFSC and lab resources); 101 positions cover 202 students. (AFSCR 26-3, 6 September 1968.)	
Low pay for co-op students results in low retention rates.		Army CSC		Navy USAF	Navy reexamined problems; they do not really exist at this time.	
Inequities in health benefits for some co-op students on quarter system.	CSC				Army has prepared a letter to CSC requesting use of advanced in-hire rates. Forwarded by the ASD(M&RA) 31 January 1969 with DDR&E's concurrence.	CSC is preparing a questionnaire for all agencies. After analysis of answers, CSC will establish new policies on salaries, grades, etc., if required.
Inability to make firm offers of employment.	USAF			Navy Army	CSC has taken action to continue health benefits for students on quarter system.	
					Referenced problem at Brooks AFB is due to lack of manpower spaces. New AFSC co-op spaces will solve this problem.	

Note: *Identified by the CSC as a major problem.

STATUS OF DOD/CSC PROBLEMS (continued)

Problem	Resolved	In process	Unresolved	Not a problem	Action taken	Action remaining
1.4b <u>Laboratory Participation in Recruiting Programs:</u> Some AMC labs believed the system is overcentralized.		Army		Navy USAF	AMC has conducted orientation sessions for laboratory personnel. Policies and procedures have been established.	Publication of AMC policy and procedures.
*1.4c <u>Timeliness and Effectiveness of Recruiting Efforts:</u> Manpower controls and personnel procedures combine to reduce the effectiveness of recruiting personnel.	CSC	Army			CSC has speeded up preaudit for higher than minimum salary rate. All military departments agree service is now okay. Army labs can hire uniquely qualified individuals above ceiling. Army (AMC) has allocated some spaces for June graduate hiring.	Army, Navy and Air Force problems that are directly related to manpower ceilings still await resolution. Army should examine Air Force procedures for June graduates and adopt those that are appropriate.
		Navy			Navy and CSC have worked together to see that all labs have direct recruiting authority.	Navy should examine Air Force procedures for June graduates and adopt those that are appropriate.
	USAF				AFSC has established a command-wide recruiting system and has published guidance and pamphlets. Labs have authority to hire up to a (command-established) goal with AFSC providing coverage for spaces on 30 June if required. Labs are allowed to carry June graduates as overage (subject to month accounting). AFSC will also provide spaces to labs for outstanding people when the lab has no spaces. (AFSCR 26-3, 6 September 1968.)	

Note: *Identified by the CSC as a major problem.

STATUS OF DOD/CSC PROBLEMS (continued)

Problem	Resolved	In process	Unresolved	Not a problem	Action taken	Action remaining
1.4d <u>Timeliness of Security Clearance Procedures:</u> Excessive delays have been experienced.	Navy			USAF	Navy considers this an atypical problem requiring no further action. Army made a detailed study of its labs and found that no significant delays are now being experienced. Interim security clearances authorized by AR 604-5 and AMCR 604-1 are being utilized.	
Navy was not accepting Defense Industrial Security Clearances Office (DISCO) clearances granted to applicants.	Navy			Army USAF	Navy now accepts DISCO clearances.	
*1.5 <u>REFERRING TECHNICAL EMPLOYEES FOR SERVICE-WIDE PLACEMENT:</u> Referral systems cause delays without producing a payoff.	Army			USAF	Army has taken steps to streamline its referral system. A 10-day maximum time limit for response has been established. Labs can get advance lists of qualified candidates. The Navy executive assignment system is now operational. This, plus the CSC system, should supplement the lab's own efforts.	
	Navy					

*Note: *Identified by the CSC as a major problem.

STATUS OF DOD/CSC PROBLEMS (continued)

Problem	Resolved	In process	Unresolved	Not a problem	Action taken	Action remaining
*1.6 DEALING WITH THE MARGINAL EMPLOYEE: Problems with the availability and use of adequate managerial techniques.	Army				<p>Army--Increased awareness of this problem has led to more training for supervisors and the development of more systematic rating procedures.</p> <p>Navy--Increased awareness of this problem has led to more dissemination of information in this area. OCMH has offered to help labs in this respect, as requested. Navy and CSC worked to eliminate adverse action procedures for terminating temporary promotions (CSC Bulletin 335-6, 12 July 1968). OCMH is working to develop new evaluation techniques for R&D personnel. Navy has started work on a trial retirement program.</p>	<p>Completion, publication and distribution of pamphlet.</p>
		USAF			<p>AFSC surveyed personnel offices, and results indicate that guidance may be adequate but needs more distribution. AFSC is preparing a "dos and don'ts" pamphlet for supervisors. AFSC project 55-60 for trial retirement is almost one year old.</p>	
			CSC			<p>CSC may seek legislation for "management optior." retirement, but believes that now is not the proper time to do it.</p>
*One-year probationary period is too short.	Army USAF				<p>Army and Air Force claim 1-year period, if properly applied, is sufficient.</p>	<p>Completion of CSC study and action on its recommendations.</p>
		Navy CSC			<p>CSC has reviewed Navy request to extend probationary period and believes it is bound by the intent of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to have a maximum of one year. But a CSC study has been initiated to determine the value of extending the probationary period.</p>	

Note: *Identified by the CSC as a major problem.

STATUS OF DOD/CSC PROBLEMS (continued)

Problem	Resolved	In process	Unresolved	Not a problem	Action taken	Action remaining
1.6 DEALING WITH THE MARGINAL EMPLOYEE (continued): *Broader appeal rights than required by the CSC.	Navy			USAF	Navy has brought appeal rights in line with CSC minimum. (CMI 751, 17 June 1968.)	
			Army		Army considered reducing appeal rights by one level, but decided to keep them two levels higher than that required by the CSC.	
*1.7 UTILIZING THE TECHNICAL STAFF: Optimum utilization of the technical staff is inhibited by manpower limitations and administrative procedures. (1) Inadequate technician support; (2) Inadequate personnel and administrative support.	Army		Army Navy USAF		(1) Manpower limitations and reductions have generally caused a shift toward higher scientist-to-technician ratios, burdening the engineer or scientist with routine tasks. Command management appears to prefer this to having fewer professionals with adequate support. (2) Army has reorganized its personnel offices to improve support to laboratories, including authorization of deputy PDs if required to provide necessary support. (CPR 200, Change 8, 3 May 1968.)	
1.8 RECOGNIZING AND DEVELOPING THE TECHNICAL STAFF:			USAF		(2) Air Force claims that manpower limitations preclude solution of this problem. Recent manpower cuts in AFSC will aggravate the problem.	
1.8a Education and Training: Central control delays approval and complicates the process. Specific USAF activities had problems in part-time training.	Navy		USAF Army		Navy simplified procedures and made participation in control pool optional.	Advanced medical training in San Antonio area awaits completion of University of Texas medical center.

Note: *Identified by the CSC as a major problem.

STATUS OF DOD/CSC PROBLEMS (continued)

Problem	Resolved	In process	Not a problem	Unresolved	Action taken	Action remaining
1.8 RECOGNIZING AND DEVELOPING THE TECHNICAL STAFF (continued):						
1.8b Attendance at Scientific Meetings: Too restricted.	Army Navy			USAF	Authority for approving attendance at scientific meetings was delegated to labs.	
1.8c Forms of Recognition Within Government: Not adequate.	Army Navy				Army encourages participation by its S&E people on committees, etc. Has added SEA R&D award. Procedures for publication of papers have been streamlined. Navy encourages wide recognition of its people through formal awards, participation on high-level panels and publications. Recognition is part of Executive Management Board career plan being developed.	Analyze result of pilot program and establish procedures for incentive cash awards. Conduct and analyze "dry run" for honorary awards and establish procedures.
		USAF			Air Force has conducted a pilot program on reduced documentation for incentive awards. A similar program for honorary and competitive awards is planned. Lab directors have been asked for names of personnel to serve on high-level committees and panels.	All three military departments should appoint top-level people to their own advisory boards.

STATUS OF DOD/CSC PROBLEMS (continued)

Problem	Resolved	In process	Unresolved	Not a problem	Action taken	Action remaining
*2.1 MATCHING SALARY OFFERS OF COMPETITORS		CSC			Government-wide salary increases have made this less of a problem. Also, a higher within-grade rate can be paid.	Battelle and DoD studies of salary structure within DoD and in industry will provide further information.
*2.2 PAYING TRAVEL EXPENSES FOR JOB INTERVIEWS			CSC		CSC has worked to have legislation introduced in Congress. Bill was submitted by Senator McGee (S 1770, 3 April 1969).	Congressional approval. CSC will continue to voice strong support for this legislation.
2.3 PAYING HIGHER WITHIN-GRADE SALARY RATES: Quick approval is required.	CSC USAF Army				CSC has issued supplement to Federal Personnel Manual clarifying rules and allowing consideration of other offers to be used as a criterion. CSC has also speeded response.	
		Navy CSC			Navy is working with CSC to get authorization for agencies to make offers subject to CSC postaudit.	CSC will submit a legislative proposal to Congress, through the BoB.
2.4 EXAMINING FOR TECHNICAL PERSONNEL: Labs were concerned that the interagency boards (IAB) would not provide the necessary services fast enough or allow for on-the-spot offers.	CSC Army Navy USAF				Examination of the problem showed that the labs' fears failed to materialize. IABs can and will train and designate agency recruiters as board agents, thus allowing on-the-spot offers.	
2.5 RECRUITING FOR SUMMER WORK: Summer hires count as part of lab ceiling; situation is complicated by 30 June reporting date.	CSC Navy USAF				A large part of the problem of summer hires has been alleviated by exempting many categories of summer hires from ceilings. Navy/DoD request to BoB to use 30 May as reporting date for ceilings (or not count June hires until July) was denied by BoB.	
	Army				Army also provides temporary spaces to the labs for summer hires.	

Note: *Identified by the CSC as a major problem.

STATUS OF DOD/CSC PROBLEMS (continued)

Problem	Resolved	In process	Unresolved	Not a problem	Action taken	Action remaining
2.5 RECRUITING FOR SUMMER WORK (continued): Late certification dates.	CSC				CSC will get certification out by 1 March upon request of agency. Also, 1968 and 1969 eligibility will be extended as long as student desires.	
Noncompetitive rehire of last year's employees.	CSC				CSC will exempt 2-year S&E students from exams if they have a 3.5 average, and 3-year students with a 3.0 average. Activities can request a selective certification by college major. CSC would not exempt all S&E students from exams. They believe national certification aids student in getting a job.	
Difficulty in reaching S&E students on certificates was experienced.	CSC Army Navy USAF					
Labs have no authority to directly appoint regional and area science competition finalists and winners.	Navy CSC			USAF Army	CSC refused Navy request for authority to directly appoint regional and area science contest winners because of the large number involved and lack of control of the quality of local competitions.	
Isolated labs have a problem because of scarce housing and nepotism limitations.	CSC				CSC rules now allow hiring relatives if they can be reached on the certificate of eligibility.	

STATUS OF DOD/CSC PROBLEMS (continued)

Problem	Resolved	In process	Unresolved	Not a problem	Action taken	Action remaining
3.1 CLASSIFYING LABORATORY POSITIONS: TDA controls precluded use of multidisciplinary positions. Classification of non-research engineering positions.	Army	Army USAF CSC		Navy USAF Navy	Army has issued clarifying instructions on the use of multidisciplinary positions. (Change 3, CPR 505, 14 October 1968.) New grade evaluation guides have been published by CSC.	Laboratory use and evaluation of the new guides.
3.2 APPLICATION OF ENGINEER EQUIVALENCY TEST: Use of State Board exams too slow.	CSC				CSC Announcement 415, October 1968, provides for the use of the Graduate Record Exam as an engineering equivalency test.	
3.3 APPLYING THE CRITERIA FOR QUALITY COLLEGE GRADUATES: Criteria are too difficult to apply for M.S. and Ph.D.	CSC				CSC has revised criteria satisfactorily.	
3.4 DIVERSE WAGE RATES: Wage Board employees in same area working for different agencies get different wages.	CSC				CSC has established a uniform Federal Wage System (CWFS effective 1 July 1968).	
3.5 APPLYING THE COMMISSION'S SUITABILITY STANDARDS: CSC refers people to labs who cannot obtain the proper security clearances.	Navy CSC USAF	Army			Navy has advised activities of CSC regulations that allow passing over applicants who cannot be cleared. Air Force recommends that a clearance "suitability" check be given to applicants who are being actively considered for appointments. CSC has considered this and will expedite handling on specific requests, but not as a matter of routine practice.	

STATUS OF DOD/CSC PROBLEMS (continued)

Problem	Resolved	In process	Unresolved	Not a problem	Action taken	Action remaining
3.6 USE OF THE COMMISSION'S QUESTIONNAIRE IN EXAMINING FOR UNGRADED (WB) POSITIONS: There was uncertainty regarding the value and use of this questionnaire.	CSC				The questionnaire has been revised and will be further simplified and refined on a continuing basis to meet the requirements of both employers and applicants.	
3.7 TRAINING FOR AGENCY RECRUITERS	CSC				CSC has offered training upon request of an agency.	
	Army				Army has briefed, and will continue to brief, its personnel.	
	Navy				Navy is conducting a workshop in interviewing and recruiting.	
	USAF				AFSC has a Recruiter's Guide and a Systems Command Professional Employment Handbook for recruiters.	
3.8 CONFLICT OF INTEREST REGULATIONS: Loss of morale because the regulation is too broad in scope.	Navy			Army USAF	New regulations and instructions reduce the number of employees involved and should alleviate the problem. (SECNAVINST 5370.2E, 29 November 1967.)	

ABBREVIATIONS

AFR -- Air Force regulation
AFSC -- Air Force Systems Command
AFSCR -- AFSC regulation
AMC -- Army Materiel Command
ASD(M&RA) -- Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower
and Reserve Affairs)
ASD(SA) -- Assistant Secretary of Defense (Systems
Analysis)

BoB -- Bureau of the Budget

CPO -- civilian personnel office/officer
CPR -- civilian personnel regulation (Army)
CSC -- Civil Service Commission

DA -- Department of the Army
DDR&E -- Director of Defense Research and Engineering
DISCO -- Defense Industrial Security Clearances Office
DoD -- Department of Defense

E&S -- engineers and scientists

F&DP -- Five-Year Defense Program

IAB -- interagency boards

MET -- manpower engineering team

OCMM -- Office of Civilian Manpower Management (Navy)
OSD -- Office of the Secretary of Defense

PPBS -- planning, programming, budgeting system

RDT&E -- research, development, test and evaluation

SEA -- Southeast Asia
S&E -- scientific and engineering

TDA -- table of distribution and allowances (Army)

UDL -- unit detail listing (Air Force)